Organizational Model #1

City operated and managed moorage. City is the lead on all capital improvements.

PROS:

- Use of City's debt capacity to finance capital improvements ***
- Potentially better oversight of the moorages**
- Way to go, most benefit
- No concessionaire costs
- Stronger commitment to long-term
- More accountability**
- Staffing coverage would be better
- Not needing to provide outside profit
- City has full control

CONS:

- City has no expertise in running moorages ****
- Costs might be higher if City needs to hire consulting help
- More layers of bureaucracy**
- City reluctant
- Slow moving bureaucracy**
- No incentive for innovation and improvement
- Need marina expertise
- Low City priority*
- Caught up in politics
- City needs to acquire expertise

Organizational Model #2

Third party operates the moorage. City is the lead on all capital improvements.

PROS:

- *3rd party has experience and can innovate based on this experience***

- *3rd party can put fresh eyes on how the moorage works**
- *Ability to get competitive bids*
- *Only good with fixed operating costs*
- *Operator involved in improvements***
- *Right operator/relationship could be beneficial*
- *Manager would have incentive to do a good job*
- *City can dictate what is in City's long-term interests*
- *City can have interest while letting an operator do their thing*
- *Stability for tenants*
- *Need for agreement to be tight and thorough****

CONS:

- *3rd party can be inefficient or ineffective **
- *Well-functioning relationship with the City will be necessary to make this work*
- *Oversight could be added expense*
- *City needs to provide profit to an outside firm*
- *City will need to make capital funds available*
- *Lack of oversight**
- *Cumbersome process**
- *Requires turn-around from past practices*
- *Not as accountable to public*

Organizational Model #3

Third party operates the moorage. Third party manages the capital improvements (moorage stays in public ownership).

PROS:

- *Could bring private investment in the moorage*
- *Could shield General Subfund from additional costs down the road*
- *Profit motive, incentive upgrade*
- *Third party invests their money – "skin in the game"*
- *Lower/no cost to City for capital investment*

CONS:

- *Need to structure deal so that 3rd party has proper incentive to bring in private investment*
- *Unclear if this model will pencil out*
- *Not financially viable*
- *Commercialization threat*
- *Location and size doesn't work*
- *Absence of public benefit motive*
- *Absence of public input (rates, slip sizes)*
- *Long-term contract*

Organizational Model #4

For the last two models, operational model includes managing both Leschi and Lakewood moorages.

PROS:

- *May make the operation more cost effective and profitable in fewer years (clear metrics for each)**
- *Combining the two moorages addresses all the needs in terms of boat sizes*
- *Increase the number of respondents to RFQ*
- *More commonality than diversity*

CONS:

- Requires two communities to work together despite their disparate interests, tenants, and needs*
- Decrease number of responders to RFQ

Someone needs to be at Lakewood.